

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

SRI INTERNATIONAL, INC., a California
Corporation,

Plaintiff and
Counterclaim-Defendant,

v.

INTERNET SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,
a Delaware corporation, INTERNET
SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., a Georgia
corporation, and SYMANTEC
CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

Defendants and
Counterclaim-Plaintiffs.

C. A. No. 04-1199 (SLR)

VERDICT FORM

We, the jury in the above-entitled action, unanimously find the following verdict on the questions submitted to us:

I. INFRINGEMENT BY SYMANTEC

The Symantec Accused Products are: (1) iForce IDS, ManHunt 3.0, Symantec Network Security 4.0, and the Symantec Network Security 7100 Series appliances (the "Manhunt Products"); and (2) the combination of Symantec Gateway Security 5400, 5600, or 1600 Series (the "SGS Products") with Incident Manager 3.0 or the Security Information Manager Series 9500 appliances (the "Manager Products").

1. **Direct – Literal:** Has SRI proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that *Symantec* literally infringes the following claims of the '615 and '203 patents?

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

	QUESTION 1: LITERAL INFRINGEMENT BY SYMANTEC			
	Manhunt Products		SGS Products and Manager Products	
	YES (finding for SRI)	NO (finding for Symantec)	YES (finding for SRI)	NO (finding for Symantec)
Patent No. 6,711,615				
Claim 1	✓		✓	
Claim 13	✓		✓	
Claim 14	✓		✓	
Claim 16	✓		✓	
-Patent No. 6,484,203				
Claim 1	✓		✓	
Claim 12	✓		✓	

2. **Inducement – Literal:** Has SRI proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that *Symantec* induces literal infringement by its customers of the following claims of the '615 and '203 patents?

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

QUESTION 2: INDUCEMENT OF LITERAL INFRINGEMENT BY SYMANTEC CUSTOMERS				
	Manhunt Products		SGS Products and Manager Products	
	YES (finding for SRI)	NO (finding for Symantec)	YES (finding for SRI)	NO (finding for Symantec)
Patent No. 6,711,615				
Claim 1	✓		✓	
Claim 13	✓		✓	
Claim 14	✓		✓	
Claim 16	✓		✓	
Patent No. 6,484,203				
Claim 1	✓		✓	
Claim 12	✓		✓	

II. INFRINGEMENT BY ISS

The ISS Accused Products for the '615 and '203 patents are the ISS sensors (RealSecure Network, Guard, Server, and Desktop series and Proventia A, G, M, Server, and Desktop series) in combination with Fusion 2.0. The ISS Accused Products for the '338 patent are the Proventia Anomaly Detection System (Proventia ADS) products.

3. **Direct – Literal:** Has SRI proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that *ISS* literally infringes the following claims of the '615, '203, and '338 patents?

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

	QUESTION 3 LITERAL INFRINGEMENT BY ISS	
	YES (finding for SRI)	NO (Finding for ISS)
Patent No. 6,711,615		
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 13	✓	
Claim 14	✓	
Claim 16	✓	
Patent No. 6,484,203		
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 12	✓	
Patent No. 6,321,338		
Claim 1		✓
Claim 11		✓
Claim 12		✓
Claim 13		✓
Claim 24		✓

4. **Inducement – Literal:** Has SRI proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that *ISS* induces literal infringement by its customers of the following claims of the '615, '203, and '338 patents?

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

	QUESTIONS INDUCEMENT OF LITERAL INFRINGEMENT BY ISS CUSTOMERS	
	YES (finding for SRI)	NO (finding for ISS)
Patent No. 6,711,615		
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 13	✓	
Claim 14	✓	
Claim 16	✓	
Patent No. 6,484,203		
Claim 1	✓	
Claim 12	✓	
Patent No. 6,321,338		
Claim 1		✓
Claim 11		✓
Claim 12		✓
Claim 13		✓
Claim 24		✓

III. VALIDITY OF '615, '203, AND '338 PATENTS

5. **Anticipation:** Have Defendants (*Symantec and ISS*) proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of the '615, '203, and '338 patents are invalid due to anticipation?

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

	YES (finding for Defendants)	NO (finding for SRI)
Patent No. 6,711,615		
Claim 1		✓
Claim 13		✓
Claim 14		✓
Claim 16		✓
Patent No. 6,484,203		
Claim 1		✓
Claim 12		✓
Patent No. 6,321,338		
Claim 1		✓
Claim 11		✓
Claim 12		✓
Claim 13		✓
Claim 24		✓

6. **Obviousness:** Have defendants (*Symantec and ISS*) proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of the '615 and '203 patents are invalid due to obviousness?

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

	YES (finding for Defendants)	NO (finding for SRI)
Patent No. 6,711,615		
Claim 1		✓
Claim 13		✓
Claim 14		✓
Claim 16		✓
Patent No. 6,484,203		
Claim 1		✓
Claim 12		✓

7. **Best Mode:** Have defendants (*Symantec and ISS*) proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the following claims of the '615 and '203 patents are invalid due to failure by the named inventors to disclose what they believed to be the best mode of practicing their invention at the time they filed their patent application?

Please check the boxes that reflect your verdict.

	YES (finding for Defendants)	NO (finding for SRD)
Patent No. 6,711,615		
Claim 1		✓
Claim 13		✓
Claim 14		✓
Claim 16		✓
Patent No. 6,484,203		
Claim 1		✓
Claim 12		✓

